IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 7416 of 2004

For Approval and Signature:

HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

==========

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : YES

2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO

3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO

4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO

5. Whether it is to be circulated to the concerned Magistrate/Magistrates,Judge/Judges,Tribunal/Tribunals? : NO

HARIOM @ BOBI RAMSING SAINI

Versus

POLICE COMMISSIONER SURAT

Appearance:

1. Special Civil Application No. 7416 of 2004

MR MP SHAH for Petitioner No. 1

MS. KRUTI M SHAH for Petitioner No. 1

MS HB PUNANI, AGP for Respondent No. 1-3

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.K.BUCH

Date of decision: 13/12/2004

ORAL JUDGEMENT

1. Heard ld. counsel Ms.Kruti Shah for the petitioner detenu and ld. AGP Ms. HB Punani for the

State. Affidavit-in-reply filed by Commissioner of Police, Surat City, tendered today by ld. AGP Ms. Punani is taken on record.

2. By this petition under Article 226 read with Articles 21 & 22(5) of the Constitution of India, the petitioner detenu has challenged the legality and validity of the order of detention dated 03.06.2004 passed by the Police Commissioner, Surat City, in exercise of the powers conferred on him by Section 3(2) of The Gujarat Prevention of Anti-Social Activities Act, 1985 (hereinafter referred to as the PASA Act) against the petitioner-detenu. The petitioner detenu has been branded as "boot-legger" as defined under Sec.2(b) of the PASA ACt.

3. The grounds for detention supplied to the detenu petitioner indicate that the petitioner was found involved in solitary single offence punishable under Sections 66B, 65AE, 81 of the Bombay Prohibition Act being I.CR No. III 375/2004 registered with Mahidharpura Police Station. It is recorded by the authority that the petitioner is a "boot-legger" and is involved in the activities dangerous to the society.

4. The petitioner has challenged the legality and validity of the order of detention on number of grounds as mentioned in the memo of the petition. Ld. counsel Ms. Shah for the petitioner, has taken this Court through the contentions raised in the petition. However, she has focussed his arguments mainly on two grounds. The first ground pressed into service by ld. counsel Ms. Shah is that the petitioner has been wrongly branded as "bootlegger" and his activities are dangerous to maintenance of public order, as he was involved in solitary offence under Bombay Prohibition Act. The second ground pressed into service is that as per the settled legal position of the decision of the Apex Court in the case of Sohanlal Surajram Visnoi v/s State of Gujarat & Ors., 2004(2) GLR 1051, the impugned order of detention requires to be quashed as the case the present case is squarely covered by the ratio of the aforesaid decision.

5. I have gone through the above-cited decision. For the sake of convenience, I would like to quote relevant paras 4 & 5 of the said decision:-

"4. Article 22(3) of the Constitution of India expressly provides that the safeguards contained in Art.22(1) and 22(2) of the

Constitution are not to apply to preventive detention. Article 22(4) of the Constitution provides and opens with double negative, put in positive form, and in its real substance, means that a law which provides for preventive detention for a period longer than three months, shall contain all the provisions prescribed in clauses (4) and (5) of Article 22 of the Constitution. Article 22(5) of the Constitution prescribes that when any person under a preventive detention law is detained, the authority making the order, shall as soon as may be, communicate to such person, the grounds on which the order has been made, and shall afford him with the earliest opportunity of making a representation against the order. Article 22(5) of the Constitution is of general importance and operation in respect of every detention order made under any preventive detention law.

5. In this group of petitions, all the detenus, except one in Special Civil Application No.825 of 2003, are treated and described as "bootleggers" as defined under Sec.2(b) of the P.A.S.A. Act and only one offence is registered against each detenu under the provisions of the Bombay Prohibition Act, 1949. Whereas in Special Civil Application No.825/2003, the detenu is treated as "dangerous person" as defined in Sec.2(c) of the P.A.S.A. Act, and in this case also, a solitary incident is made basis for passing the detention order against him."

6. It has been next submitted that the last case registered against the detenu is 24.05.2004 and sponsoring authority recorded statements of two witnesses on 27.05.2004 which came to be verified by the detaining authority on 02.06.2004 and immediately on the next day, the impugned order of detention is passed. Hence, there is hot haste in passing the order of detention which suffers from non-application of mind and mechanical exercise of powers and hence the ratio of the ratio of the decision of this Court in the case of Ranubhai Bharwad (Vekaria) v/s State of Gujarat & Ors., 2000(3) GLR 2696 would help the petitioner-detenu. It is not necessary to reproduce relevant para-9 of the said decision, but in the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the opinion that the ratio of the above-cited decision would squarely cover the case of the present petitioner and hence petition requires to be allowed. So, on this ground also, impugned order of detention

requires to be quashed and set aside.

7. For the reasons aforesaid, this petition is allowed. Impugned order of detention dated 03.06.2004 passed by the Commissioner of Police, Surat City, is hereby quashed and set aside and detenu is hereby ordered to be set at liberty forthwith if he is not required to be detained in any other case. Rule is made absolute.

Direct Service is permitted.

[C. K.BUCH, J]

*rawal